

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS . P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,760	09/12/2003	Andrea Liebmann-Vinson	020187.0238	5991
46851	7590 11/03/2006	•	EXAMINER	
DAVID W. I			FEELY, M	ICHAEL J
	CKINSON AND COMP	ANY	Angraga	D. DED) W. (DED
1 BECTON D	RIVE, MC110		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FRANKLIN LAKES, NJ 07417			1712	
			DATE MAILED: 11/03/2000	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/660,760	LIEBMANN-VINSON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Michael J. Feely	1712	

		7.0.4 41114	1
	Michael J. Feely	1712	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 October 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) a
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of le appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	hut mias to the data of files a baid		
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co	onsideration and/or search (see NO	, will <u>not</u> be entered b TF helow):	ecause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. \square The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		-	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	⋈ will not be entered, or b) □ will will will will will will will	ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: 38-57.			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>30 and 31</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7,9-23,25-29 and 32-37</u> .			ŕ
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	at before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		million	•
		Michael J. Feely	

Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1712

Application No. 10/660,760

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

(a) The amendment to claim 1 would require further search and consideration. Applicant has attempted to incorporate the limitations of claim 30 into independent claim 1; however, the incorporation of these limitations was incomplete. Where claim 30 discloses, "chemical sensor particles dispersed in said polymer matrix", the current proposed version of claim 1 merely recites, "wherein said polymeric matrix comprises chemical sensing particles". This broader scope encompasses materials that have sensor particles dispersed in, embedded in, partially embedded in, or surface-coated on the flexible substrate. Not only would this change in scope require further search, it would also require further consideration with respect to 35 USC 112, 1st and 2nd paragraphs. A scope of enablement rejection would be contemplated because the specification only discusses embodiments featuring dispersed particles – see paragraph 0019. An indefinite rejection would also be contemplated on the basis that the claim is incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements (dispersion of particles in the polymer matrix).